DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

**RECEIVED** 

FIELD HEARING

**APR 1 4** 2003

Federal Communications Commissic

BROADCAST OWNERSHIP EN BANC

+ + + + +

Office of the Secretary

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

CHAIRMAN POWELL PRESIDING

02-217

No. of Copies rec'd O List A B C D E

This transcript was produced from audio tapes. Inconsistencies may occur between the actual spoken transcription due to and the recording impediments.

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Morning Session
Official Opening, Marlene Dortch, Secretary 3
Welcome, K. Dane Snowden, Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau 5
Opening Statements:
Michael K. Powell, Chairman 7
Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner 12
Michael J. Copps, Commissioner 18
Kevin J. Martin, Commissioner 25
Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner 29
Summary of Broadcast Ownership Rules and Key Issues, Thomas G. Krattenmaker (Moderator) Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky & Popeo
Panel Discussion: Diversity Issues
L. Brent Bozell 111, Parents Television Council 49
Robert Corn-Revere, Hogan & Hartson 54
Jay Ireland, NBC Television Stations 59
Alfred C. Liggins, Radio One, Inc 65
Victoria Riskin, Writers Guild of America, West
Andrew Jay Schwartzman, Media Access Project 75
Wendy Thompson, ZGS Broadcast Holdings, Inc 79
Public Comments 111
Lunch Break Afternoon Session

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE.. N.W WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Panel	Discussion: Competition Issues	
	David Croteau, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Virginia Commonwealth University	127
	Linda Foley, The Newspaper Guild-CWA	131
	Victor Miller, Bear Stears & Co. Inc	136
	Ed Munson, WAVY(TV)/WVBT(TV) Norfolk, VA	141
	Bruce Owen, Economists Incorporated	146
	Jonathan Rintels, Center for the Creative Community	150
	James L. Winston, National Association of Black Owned Broadcasters, Inc	155
Public	C Comments	188
Break		
Panel	Discussion: Localism Issues	
	Frank A. Blethen, The Seattle Times	205
	Thomas R. Herwitz, Fox Television Stations, Inc	209
	Mark P. Mays, Clear Channel Worldwide	212
	Deborah McDermott, Young Broadcasting Inc	217
	Chris Powell, Journal Inquirer	221
	John F. Sturm, Newspaper Association of America	225
	Jenny Toomey, Future of Music Coalition	229
Publi	c Comments	236
Adiou	rn	257

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10:00 a.m.

SECRETARY DORTCH: Today's hearing will focus on the FCC's Broadcast Ownership rules and will give the public an opportunity to voice its opinions about the Commission's examination to determine whether any of the rules are no longer in the public interest as a result of competition. This periodic examination is required by the Communications Act.

Following are the procedures for today's We will utilize a time-keeping en banc hearing. machine located in front of Chairman Powell maintain time limits on each presentation. Panelists will each have a total of five minutes to make their individual presentations. The green light will stay lit for the first three minutes of your remarks. the yellow light signals, you have one additional minute to sum up your presentation and close your remarks. The red light signals the end of your allotted time. Please conclude your remarks at that time.

Following the morning session, a lunch break will be held from 12:10 p.m. to 1:10 p.m.

Information concerning nearby eateries is available on the table to the right outside of the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

ballroom doors.

The Convention Center prohibits the bringing in of food and drink from outside vendors.

The afternoon session of the hearing will begin promptly at 1:10 p.m. Sign language interpreters are available to assist people with disabilities. If you need an interpreter, please indicate this now to the FCC interpreter who is standing with her hand raised.

The transcript of this hearing will be made a part of the record and will be available on the FCC website, <a href="www.fcc.gov">www.fcc.gov</a> approximately 14 days from today.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, the hearing will now begin.

Mr. **K.** Dane Snowden, Chief of the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs will serve as our MC.

Thank you.

MR. SNOWDEN: Good morning. On behalf of the Commission I would like to welcome everyone to the FCC's Broadcast Ownership en banc hearing. In addition, I would like to thank and extend the Commission's thanks and appreciation to all of the invited panelists and the members of the public for

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

joining us from the Richmond area and from across the country.

As many of you know, the Commission is in the midst of its most comprehensive review of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules, some of which date back to the early 1940s. Every two years the Commission is required by Congress to examine its broadcast ownership rules and determine whether the rules are necessary in the public interest as the result of competition. If a rule cannot be justified, it must be modified or eliminated.

Today's en banc hearing is another example of how the Commission is interacting with the public on this very important subject. In addition to participating in the public forum sponsored by Columbia University, we have received more than 18,000 comments on this subject, the vast majority of which are from individual citizens.

Our goal today is to hear from the public on important issue of Broadcast the Ownership currently before the Commission. It should be noted that the Commission's ultimate task in fulfilling its public interest responsibility is to promote diversity, localism and competition. In addition, we must craft rules that are sustainable in the eyes of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

the courts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are very interested in learning how the three prongs of diversity, localism and competition are promoted under our current broadcast ownership regime. As the FCC designs rules, we strive to establish a framework which accounts for the modern day marketplace. All of this stated, it is important to note that, by the end of this proceeding, the FCC intends to have broadcast ownership rules that reflect the current marketplace and are legally sustainable.

Before we begin with our moderator and the panels, I would first like to turn the floor over to the Chairman and Commissioners for their opening remarks.

#### Chairman Powell?

CHAIRMAN POWELL: Thank you, Dane, and Federal Communications welcome everyone this to Commission field hearing. I'll get right to an important question. It seems like every time we have one of these it's snowing. I don't know what that means, but we'll fight through it. But I want to let everyone who has traveled to know that we are going to keep a close eye on the weather and do what we need to do in terms of adjusting schedules, if that becomes a problem, just so that you know.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Actually this snow only heightens gratitude for the sacrifices our panelists have made to be here today. It is commendable that they agreed to take time out of their busy schedules to prepare for and participate in today's hearing. Given the weather conditions, their efforts deeply are appreciated.

I would also like to thank Dane Snowden and his tireless team for making this broadcast ownership hearing happen. Until you've actually tried to set up a field hearing like this, you may not appreciate how much work is truly involved. They did a fabulous job and I appreciate their efforts.

I am enormously pleased so many people have expressed an interest in the Commission's review of broadcast ownership regulations. The number of comments we have received is staggering, multiple thousands from the general public alone. It is gratifying to witness first hand the unparalleled opportunities technology now provides the American public to participate in the democratic process. This record combined with the forum we hold today, will create one of the most exhaustive records in recent FCC history, one deserving of a proceeding of this magnitude.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I am particularly pleased to see that the staff arranged for the leadoff presentation to address "legal issues" which are often perceived as pesky to some, but essential to good policy making. There are issues in media policy far sexier than the legal framework, but none is more critical if you wish to understand how we will make ownership policy decisions.

For better or worse, the FCC has hundreds of rules and regulations currently on its books. Each day, when my colleagues and I come to work in the morning, we have plenty to do. Thankfully, one thing we don't have to do is re-justify every rule in the book. Each existing rule is generally presumed to be as valid today as it was yesterday.

Sadly, the broadcast ownership rules are fundamentally different pursuant to Congress' design. Every two years without fail, the Commission is required by statute to review the broadcast ownership rules. And when it does, it is legally required to presume each rule is no longer needed unless we find otherwise according to the courts. Unless we can rejustify each broadcast ownership rule, in short, and under current market conditions, the rule goes away.

Under this tough review standard of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

review, courts have become far more skeptical of FCC rationales for imposing limits on broadcast ownership. Five times in the past two years we have defended our ownership rules in court. And sadly, five times we have lost. 0-5 is not an enviable record.

The common theme of the courts' criticism is that we have failed to justify our rules in light of today's media environment. What the courts have told us, in no uncertain terms, is that the biennial standard is a rigorous test. Either we produce evidence that the rule is still necessary, or we must eliminate it and if we do not, they will do it for us.

If the Commission does the same half-hearted effort it did in the last Biennial Review, I guarantee you that every one of the broadcast rules will be swept away in a court of law. Let's see if we can put that Genie back in the bottle.

Yet we all agree that some broadcast ownership limits are indeed critical if we are to maintain a robust marketplace of ideas. The public interest is all about promoting diversity, localism, and competition. We can achieve these goals -- and the courts will agree with us -- if we do it correctly.

The right way is building rules that

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2 1

reflect today's media market. We do that by gathering evidence on the critical questions: How do Americans use the media? Where do they get their news from? What industry structure best promotes diverse and innovative media content?

The FCC staff kicked off that effort by conducting a dozen studies on the workings of the media. Whatever those studies suggest for ownership policy, they make an important procedural point -- that this rulemaking will be driven by evidence, not just intuition or personal preference. This agency tried personal preference in the last biennial review and got hammered for it.

That's why we have proceeded methodically this time around. The court cases gave us clear guidance on how to do the biennial review correctly. We took that guidance to heart, we conducted a large number of studies, and then we began the biennial. We had a long comment period so interested parties could formulate their own views and provide us with them. And several public hearings, including today's, are being held around the nation.

I hope today's hearing will build on the enormous record already before us. We have specifically set aside time for members of the public

#### NEAL R. GROSS

to air their views and I very much look forward to hearing them.

Finally, let me once again thank the panelists for agreeing to join us today to share their views as well as my colleagues for being here. The speakers with us today are an enormously talented and accomplished group, and I very much look forward to their statements and the subsequent dialogue.

Commissioner Abernathy?

COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here. First, I want to thank Dane Snowden and everyone involved in organizing today's event. I also want to thank everyone that is taking part in today's hearing whether you are on a panel or you're coming here as part of the audience, you are making an invaluable contribution to the discussion on broadcast ownership. You braved the elements to get here, as the Chairman said. So thank you very much.

I don't have to tell any of you about the important role that the media plays in our education, our entertainment, and in our civic discourse. For this very reason, the FCC has continually focused on the importance of promoting localism, diversity and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2 1

competition when we're crafting media ownership rules.

I am committed to furthering these long-standing goals by re-examining our rules to ensure that our regulations advance and do not undermine our policy goals.

It is also important to note that Congress instructed us to review our broadcast ownership rules to determine if they are still necessary in the public interest in light of the changes in competition. In addition to this Congressional mandate, however, the courts have also weighed in and not very kindly, and they've weighed in by overturning some of our media And as the Chairman mentioned our ownership rules. win/loss record in the courts over the past two years has been rather pathetic. The courts have also made clear that we must justify the retention of any of our rules, or they will be eliminated. We have been faulted for failing to take into consideration the plethora of voices that are now available and for failing to take a consistent approach across all of ownership rules. These decisions the court necessarily provide the context for future decisions that the FCC makes.

No one can dispute that the marketplace has changed significantly since the adoption of many

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of our ownership rules. We now have a greater number of choices, as well as increased consolidation. ΤĦ was not that long ago that we only had three networks and some independent stations. Now, in addition to ABC, CBS and NBC, we have UPN, WB and PaxNet available Eighty-five percent of homes, to us over-the-air. moreover, have access to hundreds of cable programming networks. I know that some have expressed concern, however, that 90 percent of the top 50 cable channels are owned by the television networks and the cable These kinds of cross-ownership issues are providers. very important and we need to look at them. But I also want to look beyond the popularity of a program and ask whether we have a diverse array of choices that can reach small niche audiences that may be ignored by the mainstream, more popular programming. So, when discussing choices I will look not just at the top 50 cable networks, but also at the other national and regional networks.

I also recognize that there has been increased consolidation in the media industry; this is not surprising because companies seek the benefits of scale and scope unless curtailed by regulators or the courts. My job is to look at the effects of consolidation and to ask:

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

How has consolidation affected the amount of diverse programming people are receiving?

How has it affected the availability of local news and public affairs programming in small markets?

How has it affected competition in the marketplace?

Restrictions that may have been needed in the past to ensure competition and diversity may actually make it more difficult for programmers and station owners to provide compelling quality programming in light of the significant competition that over-the-air broadcasters are facing from other sources.

In seeking answers to these and other questions, we need to be wary of the unintended consequences of changing our rules, as well as of the unintended consequences of maintaining our rules. I want to ensure that if we eliminate or modify any of our current rules, we don't lose vibrant voices and diverse sources from our civic discourse. I also need to know what effect our current rules are having on the survival of the broadcast industry as they position themselves to compete with cable, DBS and other services. And while we talk about the 85

#### **NEALR. GROSS**

percent of people that have access to cable and satellite, we can't forget about the approximately 15 percent of the American public that only receive broadcast services. I think it's essential that free over-the-air services remain competitive and viable and continue to provide programming alternatives. What I don't want is for the competitive environment to drive the migration of quality programming to cable and away from broadcasting.

No doubt, these are important decisions and we must carefully consider the regulatory options that are available. But do not worry that we are rushing to judgment. First, government is simply incapable of rushing.

(Laughter.)

Second, we are responding to the fact that a number of rules that have been remanded or vacated by the courts, leaving the American people, the industry and the FCC in limbo. Inaction by the FCC only prolongs the uncertainty to the detriment of the public and the marketplace.

And third, without question, this is the most robust, detailed evidentiary record that I have seen in my 20 years of practicing telecommunications law.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

As Dane stated, we sought comment on 12 studies and we have received over 3000 comments, over 2900 of which are from individual citizens. Tn addition, there have been over 10,000 e-mails from the public, and a number of public hearings have been held and are being held again in the future. I am taking a hard look at this information as are I know all of my But don't forget, the statute and the colleagues. courts require the Commission to act on a timely basis, and it is our obligation and duty to respect and adhere to that schedule. We cannot let fear There will be no crystal ball available paralyze us. to us six months or a year from now. And I believe our job, why we were nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, is to make these tough decisions and not simply hope that they'll go away. And while I know that not everyone will agree with us when we make these decisions, we will be carrying out our responsibilities.

So thank you for allowing me to take a few minutes to share with you the questions that I think need to be addressed. I look forward to listening and learning from all of you, the insight and the viewpoint of the public and the industry are, as always, an essential part of the FCC's regulatory

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

process. Thank you for your time and your commitment to working with us to make well informed and well reasoned decisions that will benefit all of us.

MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you. Commissioner Copps?

COMMISSIONER COPPS: Good morning Thank you all for braving the weather to take part in this important event. Those of you from Washington have heard me say that, for me, no issue pending before the Federal Communications Commission the decision on whether important as eliminate or significantly change our media concentration protections. I say that because what we decide will have a formative influence on how our media will look for many, many years to come. Ι believe that fundamental values and democratic virtues are at stake here -- things like localism, diversity, competition and maintaining the multiplicity of voices and choices that undergird our marketplace of ideas and that nourish American democracy. And also at stake is the quality and type of the entertainment that we and our children watch and hear. So this is really important work that we are about today. think that despite Mother Nature and other challenges, we have top quality participation today. So I'm ready

#### **NEALR. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for us to roll up our sleeves and go to work.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

25

I think that we should have two goals Proceeding on an assumption that some find hard to believe, all expertise on these issues does not reside within the 1-495 Beltway. Our record needs much more breadth than the capital can provide. our first goal in coming to Richmond is to talk with members of this community and this state and to tap local expertise to help us make the right decisions and have a record of factual depth and granularity that the courts will accept in reviewing what we do and that the American people will accept. Secondly, I hope we can raise the awareness in Richmond that something important is going on at the FCC, something that each person here in the city and in the state has a stake in, something that every consumer, every citizen, should know about.

I am frankly concerned about consolidation in the media, and particularly concerned that we are on the verge of dramatically altering our nation's media landscape without the kind of broad, national debate and analysis that these issues so clearly merit.

Why am  ${\bf I}$  concerned? I'm concerned because I don't believe that we yet know the potential

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	implications of our actions. We do have some
2	experience to learn from and that is what happened
3	to radio after Congress and the Commission changed the
4	rules of the game seven years ago. Many media
5	observers believe that the loosening of ownership caps
6	and limits that took place then created real problems
7	in radio. We'll hear more about that on today's
8	panels. Arguably, consolidation also created some
9	economies and some efficiencies that allowed broadcast
10	media companies to operate more profitably and may
11	even have kept some stations from going dark and
12	depriving communities of service. We need to take
13	that into consideration. But I think most people
14	would admit that the consolidation went far beyond
15	what anyone could have foreseen in 1996.
16	Conglomerates now own dozens, even hundreds and in
17	one case, more than a thousand stations all across
18	the country. More and more <b>of</b> their programming seems
19	to originate hundreds of miles removed from listeners
20	and their communities. And we know this, there are 34
21	percent fewer radio station owners in February 2003,
22	than there were before these protections were
23	eliminated. The majority of radio markets are now
24	oligopolies. And all this in only seven short years!
25	It raises serious questions. Media

## **NEALR. GROSS**

watchers like the Media Access Project, which is here today, Consumers Union, and Professor Robert McChesney argue that this concentration has led to far less coverage of news and public interest programming. The Future of Music Coalition in its multi-year study finds a homogenization of music that gets air play and concludes that radio seems to serve now more to advertise the products of vertically integrated conglomerates than to entertain Americans with the best and most original programming.

So, should we eliminate, or substantially change, the protections that remain for television, cable, and newspapers? Before we can make that decision, we need to better understand the current media landscape and the implications of eliminating concentration protections. Today we know far too little to make an informed decision. Not only do we not have all the answers, we haven't yet teed up all the questions. Let me list just a few questions the studies don't answer.

What **is** the likely prospective effect on localism, diversity, and independence of TV, cable, radio, and newspapers if we eliminate our protections, especially given our history with radio consolidation?

How much news and public affairs

#### **NEALR. GROSS**

2 1

1 programming was broadcast in the years immediately before and after elimination  $\circ$ f FCC radio 2 concentration protections? 3 4 What effects have recent media mergers, 5 radio consolidation, and TV duopolies had on the 6 personnel and resources devoted to news, public 7 affairs, and public service programming, and on the 8 output of such programming? How about the effect on the creative arts? Will eliminating our rules result 9 in a crisis in any of those areas? 10 11 Do newspapers and co-owned broadcast stations carry similar viewpoints more frequently than 12 independent newspapers and broadcast stations? The 13 one FCC study is criticized as insufficient. 14 consolidation and co-ownership 15 affect the news' and arts' focus on issues important 16 17 to minorities and to the objective of diversity? how about children? 18 Is there a relationship between the rising 19 tide of media consolidation on the one hand and the 20 2 1 low quality and indecent programming on the other hand? 22 How are advertising and small business 23 affected? 24 25 The list goes on and on. Today hopefully we can begin to address some of these questions. We need answers to them before I can feel comfortable about making an informed decision. We need a diversity of input into the Commission on these issues that goes beyond anything we've ever had before. We need to hear from stakeholders of every stripe -- and as far as I'm concerned, anybody that lives in this democracy of ours is a stakeholder in the future of the media.

it's just not business, although So business input is essential. We want to hear from consumers, labor, educational, religious, and minority organizations, and Americans who have never heard of the Federal Communications Commission. We can pretend that these folks read the Federal Resister and can afford the lawyers to participate fully in our inside-the-beltway decision making. But we'd be kidding ourselves. This decision is too important to make in a business-as-usual way. We need America's buy-in, and we need your help in answering these questions. That is why I have put so much emphasis on outreach to those I call nontraditional stakeholders who have traditionally lacked access to the FCC. That is why I've been pushing so hard for hearings around the country.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

Something tells me this hearing will not disappoint me and we'll walk away from here knowing some facts, granular facts that we didn't know before we got here and that we'll hear some perspectives that don't just automatically float into us at the FCC.

Lastly, I want to note that all of us here today -- from the Chairman and the FCC, to media advocacy groups, academics, and industry, we are all interested in doing what's best, together, for the American people and the American consumer. with sadness this morning that Fred Rogers of Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood died today. Here was a man who really used the media to serve the public interest, and his example would remind us what we're all working for, TV, radio, cable, newspaper and internet, that something that uplifts and informs and serves. have some extraordinary people who have made a real effort to debate this issue today. That means a lot I know that we're all after the same thing and that we can work together to do the best thing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing. Thanks to Dane Snowden and his capable team for putting it together. Thanks to our panelists for taking the time to come here. And to the audience also.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SNOWDEN: Commissioner Martin?

COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Good morning and thank you for -- thanks everyone as well for braving the weather to join us at this public hearing. And Dane, I particularly want to thank you and your staff for the incredible job, as you always do, in putting this together for us.

I find enormous value in the opportunity to talk to you and actually hear from members of the public, as well as the media industry. Getting your thoughts and insights on the subject our media ownership rules is particularly important to our thorough review.

When formulating media ownership rules, three key principles have guided, and will continue to guide, our Agency's decisions: competition, diversity and localism. These core values recognize the tremendous role the media plays in a functioning democracy, where the ability to express diverse viewpoints is essential. Indeed, much of the news, information and entertainment that we receive today are from the media. Thus, any decisions the FCC makes with respect to media ownership will impact our day to day lives, the continued expression of diversity and ultimately our democratic system. Yet, we must

## **NEALR. GROSS**

address these issues. Congress has required us to review our broadcast ownership rules every two years to ensure that they are still necessary. And the courts have made clear that this cannot be a cursory review, nor can we base our conclusions on unsubstantiated beliefs.

As the Chairman has explained, if we don't adequately justify our rules, the courts may eliminate our ownership rules altogether. In that vein, the Chairman should be commended for conducting this comprehensive review.

There's no question that the courts have evaluating decisions with been our increasing Indeed, the D.C. Circuit has struck the last five media ownership rules it has reviewed. court has repeatedly criticized the Commission for failing to consider the competitive forces present in the modern media marketplace and the new voices that have been introduced since the rules were first enacted.

Indeed, the media landscape has changed significantly since the adoption of our current rules. The number of broadcast networks has doubled and we now have numerous nonbroadcast networks. There are 230 national cable programming networks and more than

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

50 premium networks that regularly rival the broadcast networks in audience share. Their is success the introduction of naturally due to widespread popularity of multi-channel video programming fact, today, over services. In 85 percent households receive their video programming via satellite or cable.

In addition, the growth and popularization of the internet has dramatically changed how people receive and distribute information. The internet represents a significant outlet for diverse use, as well as an important source of news and information to consumers.

It is with all these changes in mind that we must conduct our review of the ownership rules. Given all of the developments in the media landscape, one rule in particular is in need of review. which prohibits a company from owning a newspaper and a broadcast station in the same market has not been reviewed in almost 30 years. Today, newspapers are the only media entities that are prohibited from owning a broadcast station, even in the markets. Today, two broadcast stations are generally permitted to combine in the largest markets and could own up to six radio stations as well. Yet, newspapers

#### **NEALR. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

remain prohibited from owning even a single radio station.

The Commission has stated several times in the past seven years that this rule might need modifying, but after three notices it has yet to act. At a minimum, I think that so long as a significant number of independent voices remain in the marketplace, we should give broadcast stations and newspapers the same opportunity to combine that two television stations now have in the largest markets.

Of course, the introduction of new voices into the marketplace does not necessarily mean that all of our limits need to be relaxed or eliminated. Indeed, I believe that the FCC must be mindful of unintended consequences from any changes to our rules. For example, many people have expressed concern about the increase in consolidation that has occurred in local radio. But some of this consolidation may actually be due to the Commission's rules rather than the numerical limits set by Congress.

The problem lies in the FCC's definition of a market and in an obscure counting method for determining how many stations in a market one entity owns. The result of our practice is that the Commission sometimes treats small towns like big

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2 1

1	markets. We have raised these issues as well in the
2	current proceeding and we need to take this
3	opportunity to address them here as well.
4	Clearly, with the media marketplace
5	becoming more and more complex, there are no easy
6	answers to the task we confront. The ownership rules
7	are in need of review and in some instances revision.
8	But our guiding principles will remain at the heart of
9	all our decisions.
10	I remain committed to doing everything $I$
11	can to ensure that the FCC adopts ownership rules that
12	protect and promote competition, diversity and
13	localism in today's medium environment and I'm fully
14	aware of how central the decisions will be and will
15	make to the lives of many of you.
16	Thus, I welcome all <b>of</b> your insights and
17	commend the Chairman for instituting this proceeding
18	and scheduling this hearing. And $I$ look forward to
19	hearing from you, both today and in the months to
20	come.
21	Thank you.
22	MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you. Commissioner
23	Adelstein?
24	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Thank you, Mr.
25	Chairman and Commissioners. I'd like to thank you for

convening today's hearing. I really appreciate your leadership in pulling this together and I think it's going to be a very illuminating panel we have and thank you to Dane for pulling this together and to all the staff of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau for doing this. I'd like to thank Commissioner Copps also for his leadership in calling for all of us to get out of D.C. and to get out of the Beltway and to hear from people that are affected by this and that means everybody because everybody in this country is affected by this.

And we have an amazing group of panelists today I'm looking forward to hearing from very shortly. I thank them and the audience for braving the elements to get here.

As my colleagues have noted, we are about to make some enormous decisions, some of the most important decisions ever made by this Commission. And yesterday, for example, had hearing we on telecommunications issues at the House Commerce Committee. A lot of the hearing turned out to focus on media ownership. It turned out Members of the House Commerce Committee are deeply concerned about how this Commission takes its role as people who are charged with protecting the public interest and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

ensuring that the public interest is served as we are required to do by law in establishing the media ownership rules of this country. Because the media market isn't like other consumer products. It's not like we're dictating the price of candy here. But you could compare it in a sense to candy. Think about the children of this country. I have a new child at home and you don't want them eating sweets all the time and you don't want them watching stuff on television that's like candy. You want them watching the good stuff, things that he's going to learn from, things that are going to help his small mind to grow and to develop. And we need to look at how the rules that we establish affect our children. And we need to look at how it affects all Americans of all ages. The media really dictates the vitality of what the Supreme Court referred to as the "uninhibited marketplace of ideas."

So we need to hear from a diverse range of media voices. This is at the very core of our democracy.

I'd like **to** read **to** you a bit from a Supreme Court decision in the <u>Red Lion</u> case that touches on this issue and really, I think, lays out the role that the Supreme Court sees in law for the Commission. The Supreme Court held, and I quote, "it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24